



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,984	09/30/2003	Andrew R. Ferlitsch	10237.32	7696
65400	7590	02/27/2008		
KIRTON & MCCONKIE 1800 EAGLE GATE TOWER / 60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE P.O. BOX 45120 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84145-0120			EXAMINER HUNTSINGER, PETER K	
			ART UNIT 2625	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/27/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	<p>Application No.</p> <p align="center">10/676,984</p>	<p>Applicant(s)</p> <p align="center">FERLITSCH, ANDREW R.</p>	
	<p>Examiner</p> <p align="center">Peter K. Huntsinger</p>	<p>Art Unit</p> <p align="center">2625</p>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.</p> | <p>4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.</p> <p>5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application</p> <p>6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p> |
|---|---|

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see page 9 of the response, filed 11/27/07, with respect to claims 2 and 20 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 2 and 20 has been withdrawn.
2. Applicant's arguments, see page 9 of the response, filed 11/27/07, with respect to claims 19-25 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of claims 19-25 has been withdrawn.
3. Applicant's arguments, see pages 9-11 of the response, filed 11/27/07, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-8, 12-15 and 18-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Warmus '149 and Sinofsky '178.
4. Applicant's arguments filed 11/27/07 with respect to claims 9-11, 16, 17 and 25 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues on pages 11-13 of the response in essence that:
As Warmus '149 teaches delineation, no overlapping printing of variable and master data is allowed to occur.

- a. Warmus '149 discloses overlaying the variable pages onto the master page (col. 20, lines 1-10). Therefore overlapping of data is clearly possible and an underlay process would merely give preference to the data that is placed first

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-8 and 12-15, and 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warmus '149 in view of Sinofsky '178.

Referring to claim 1, Warmus '149 discloses in an image rendering environment, a method for dynamically adding one or more document indicia to a document when rendering the document, the method comprising: providing a rendering job in a native format that supports at least one of (i) multiple pages, and (ii) multiple images (col. 7, lines 1-6, page description language);

storing one or more document indicia (col. 9, lines 57-61, personalized information, variable image, or the like) as separate sub-images in a native format (col. 7, lines 1-6, variable page files);

correlating one or more pages of the document with one or more of the sub-images (col. 7, lines 24-36, master and variable page files merged);

defining an ordered subset of the sub-images to apply to the document (col. 7, lines 6-10, press command file specifies the manner in which the master and variable files are to be merged); and

using a process to associate the one or more sub-images with one or more of the pages of the document when rendering the document, wherein the process is one of (i)

an overlay process, (ii) an underlay process, and (iii) a composite process (col. 20, lines 1-10, overlay the variable pages on the master pages).

Warmus '149 does not disclose expressly a single file document containing separate sub-images.

Sinofsky '178 discloses a single file document containing separate sub-images (col. 3, lines 6-19, compound document that contains sub-files).

At the time of the invention, it would have obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate multiple files into one comprehensive file. The motivation for doing so would have been to maintain the integrity of the comprehensive file. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sinofsky '178 with Warmus '149 to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Referring to claim 2, Warmus '149 discloses wherein the native format is one of:

- (i) a tagged image file format; and
- (ii) a portable document format (col. 4, lines 21-31, TIFF file).

Referring to claim 3, Warmus '149 discloses wherein the document indicia is disbound from page data of the rendering job (col. 20, lines 1-10, overlay the variable pages on the master pages).

Referring to claim 4, Warmus '149 discloses wherein correlating one or more pages of the document with one or more of the sub-images comprises a linking the one or more pages in a next list (col. 7, lines 6-10, press command file specifies the manner in which the master and variable files are to be merged).

Referring to claim 5, Warmus '149 discloses wherein correlating one or more pages of the document with one or more of the sub-images comprises a sub-chaining the one or more sub-images from page images by a sub list (col. 7, lines 6-10, press command file specifies the manner in which the master and variable files are to be merged).

Referring to claim 6, Warmus '149 discloses wherein correlating one or more pages of the document with one or more of the sub-images comprises sub-chaining the one or more sub-images within sub-images (col. 11-12, lines 62-67, 1-22, object inserted defined by curser, user can insert multiple objects).

Referring to claim 7, Warmus '149 discloses wherein defining an ordered subset of the sub-images comprises creating a set of instructions in one of

- (i) a dynamic manner, and
- (ii) a static manner (col. 20, lines 49-54).

Referring to claim 8, Warmus '149 discloses wherein the overlay process includes applying an overlay on top of one of:

- (i) a page image; and
- (ii) another sub-image (col. 20, lines 1-10, overlay the variable pages on the master pages).

Referring to claim 12, Warmus '149 discloses wherein the composite process includes merging a composite with at least one of:

- (i) a page image; and

(ii) another sub-image (col. 23, lines 28-32, the master and variable pages are merged).

Referring to claim 13, Warmus '149 discloses in a printing environment, a method for adding document indicia when printing an image without the use of a printer driver, the method comprising:

- using a multi-subfile extension (Fig. 5, col. 11, lines 18-29, file 130 includes file portions) to represent multiple sub-images of a TIFF image, wherein data of the TIFF image is not converted into printing instructions by an application (col. 23, lines 21-23, files 122, 137, and 138 preprocessed to TIFF format);

- using an extension to group and locate the sub-images on a page (Fig. 5, col. 11, lines 18-29, file 130 includes file portions);

- providing one or more electronic tags to perform at least one of:

- supporting an overlay of the multiple sub-images on the page (col. 20, lines 1-10, overlay the variable pages on the master pages).;

- supporting an underlay of the multiple sub-images on the page;

- supporting a composite of the multiple sub-images on the page;

- specifying a merge order of the multiple sub-images on the page;

- specifying a location for merging the multiple sub-images on the page; and

- specifying any scaling of the multiple sub-images; and

- selectively rendering the TIFF image based on the electronic tags (col. 23, lines 21-35, process the pages for printing).

Warmus '149 does not disclose expressly a single file document containing separate sub-images.

Sinofsky '178 discloses a single file document containing separate sub-images (col. 3, lines 6-19, compound document that contains sub-files).

At the time of the invention, it would have obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate multiple files into one comprehensive file. The motivation for doing so would have been to maintain the integrity of the comprehensive file. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sinofsky '178 with Warmus '149 to obtain the invention as specified in claim 13.

Referring to claim 14, see the rejection of claim 8 above.

Referring to claim 15, see the rejection of claim 9 above.

Referring to claim 18, see the rejection of claim 12 above.

Referring to claim 19, see the rejection of claim 1 above.

Referring to claim 20, see the rejection of claim 2 above.

Referring to claim 21, see the rejection of claim 4 above.

Referring to claim 22, see the rejection of claim 7 above.

Referring to claim 23, see the rejection of claim 8 above.

Referring to claim 24, see the rejection of claim 9 above.

7. Claims 9-11, 16, 17 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warmus '149 and Sinofsky '178 as applied to claims 1, 8, 13, and 23 above, and further in view of well known prior art.

Referring to claim 9, Warmus '149 discloses the overlay but does not disclose expressly overlaying a form, page numbering, header, footer, or caption. Official Notice is taken that it is well known and obvious in the art to overlay one of:

- (i) a form;
- (ii) a page numbering;
- (iii) a header;
- (iv) a footer; and
- (v) a caption (See MPEP 2144.03).

The motivation for doing so would have been to provide useful information on all printed pages of a document. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine well known prior art with Warmus '149 to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

Referring to claim 10, Warmus '149 discloses wherein the overlay process includes applying an overlay on top of one of:

- (i) a page image; and
- (ii) another sub-image (col. 20, lines 1-10, overlay the variable pages on the master pages).

Warmus '149 does not disclose expressly applying an underlay process. Official Notice is taken that it is well known and obvious in the art to apply an underlay (See MPEP 2144.03). The motivation for doing so would have been to retain the information of the master page of the overlapping region as opposed to the variable page.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine well known prior art with Warmus '149 to obtain the invention as specified in claim 10.

Referring to claim 11, Warmus '149 discloses adding document indicia to a document but does not disclose expressly a watermark. Official Notice is taken that it is well known and obvious in the art to utilize a watermark when printing a document (See MPEP 2144.03). The motivation for doing so would have been to protect a document from counterfeit. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine well known prior art with Warmus '149 to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

Referring to claim 16, see the rejection of claim 10 above.

Referring to claim 17, see the rejection of claim 11 above.

Referring to claim 25, see the rejection of claim 11 above.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Application/Control Number:
10/676,984
Art Unit: 2625

Page 10

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter K. Huntsinger whose telephone number is (571)272-7435. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on (571)272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PKH



GABRIEL GARCIA
PRIMARY EXAMINER